

1 Jahan C. Sagafi (Cal. Bar No. 224887)  
2 Relic Sun (Cal. Bar No. 306701)  
3 Rachel Dempsey (Cal. Bar No. 310424)  
OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP  
One Embarcadero Center, 38th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 638-8800  
Facsimile: (415) 638-8810  
jsagafi@outtengolden.com  
rsun@outtengolden.com  
rdempsey@outtengolden.com

Thomas Saenz (Cal. Bar No. 159430)  
Joel Marrero (Cal. Bar No. 275601)  
Andrés Gallegos (Cal. Bar No. 313090)  
MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE AND  
EDUCATIONAL FUND  
634 S. Spring St., 11th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90014  
Telephone: (213) 629-2512  
Facsimile: (213) 629-0266  
tsaenz@maldef.org  
jmarrero@maldef.org  
agallegos@maldef.org

8  
9 *Attorney for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*  
*(Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page)*

10  
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
13 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

14 MITZIE PEREZ, ANDRES ACOSTA,  
15 SERGIO BARAJAS, TERESA DIAZ  
16 VEDOY, VICTORIA RODAS, and SAMUEL  
17 TABARES VILLAFUERTE, individually and  
on behalf of all others similarly situated, and  
CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF UNITED  
18 LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,

22 Defendant.

CASE NO. 17 Civ. 454

THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT  
FOR VIOLATION OF  
42 U.S.C. § 1981 AND CALIFORNIA  
STATE LAW

CLASS ACTION

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiffs Mitzie Perez, Andres Acosta, Sergio Barajas, Teresa Diaz Vedoy, Victoria Rodas, and  
 2 Samuel Tabares Villafuerte (the “Individual Plaintiffs”), individually and on behalf of all others  
 3 similarly situated, and the California League of United Latin American Citizens (“California LULAC”)  
 4 (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) by their attorneys, bring the following allegations against Defendant Wells  
 5 Fargo Bank, N.A. (“Wells Fargo” or “Defendant”):

#### 6 SUMMARY OF CLAIM

7 1. Plaintiffs Mitzie Perez, Andres Acosta, Sergio Barajas, Teresa Diaz Vedoy, Victoria  
 8 Rodas, and Samuel Tabares Villafuerte, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, and  
 9 California LULAC bring this case against Wells Fargo for unlawful discrimination in violation of the  
 10 Civil Rights Act of 1866, as codified by 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (“Section 1981”), the Unruh Civil Rights Act,  
 11 as codified by California Civil Code §§ 51 *et seq.*, and the Unfair Competition Law, as codified by  
 12 California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

13 2. Wells Fargo, an American multinational banking and financial services company,  
 14 outright refuses to extend certain types of credit to non-United States citizens who reside in the United  
 15 States and hold either (i) Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (“DACA”) status, (ii) temporary  
 16 protected status, or (iii) another legally protected status under any United States visa. Wells Fargo’s  
 17 policies of denying aliens with DACA and other legally protected statuses the right to contract for credit  
 18 based on alienage or immigration status is discriminatory and unlawful under Section 1981, Sections  
 19 51(b) and 51.5 of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, and Section 17200 of the California Unfair Competition  
 20 Law.

#### 21 PARTIES

##### 22 ***Plaintiff Mitzie Perez***

23 3. Plaintiff Mitzie Perez is a third-year undergraduate student at the University of  
 24 California, Riverside, majoring in Gender & Sexuality Studies.

25 4. Ms. Perez has authorization to work in the U.S. under DACA.

1           ***Plaintiff Andres Acosta***

2       5. Plaintiff Andres Acosta is a resident of Austin, Texas and a small business owner. He  
 3 has a bachelor's degree in construction science and a master's degree in real estate from Texas A&M  
 4 University.

5       6. Mr. Acosta has authorization to work in the U.S. under DACA.

6           ***Plaintiff Sergio Barajas***

7       7. Plaintiff Sergio Barajas is a part-time student at Chabot Community College in Hayward,  
 8 California.

9       8. Mr. Barajas has authorization to work in the U.S. under DACA.

10          ***Plaintiff Teresa Diaz Vedoy***

11       9. Plaintiff Teresa Diaz Vedoy is an undergraduate student at Cerritos College in Norwalk  
 12 California, majoring in Anthropology.

13       10. Ms. Diaz Vedoy has authorization to work in the U.S. under DACA.

14          ***Plaintiff Victoria Rodas***

15       11. Plaintiff Victoria Rodas is a second-year graduate student at Loyola Marymount  
 16 University ("LMU"), located in Los Angeles, California, studying counseling.

17       12. Ms. Rodas has authorization to work in the U.S. under DACA.

18          ***Plaintiff Samuel Tabares Villafuerte***

19       13. Plaintiff Samuel Tabares Villafuerte is a third-year undergraduate student at California  
 20 State Polytechnic University, located in Pomona, California, majoring in Engineering.

21       14. Mr. Tabares Villafuerte has authorization to work in the U.S. under DACA.

22          ***Plaintiff California LULAC***

23       15. Plaintiff California LULAC is a Latino organization with members and chapters located  
 24 in many cities and towns throughout the State of California. Plaintiff California LULAC files this  
 25 action individually as a distinguished Latino civil rights organization and on behalf of its DACA  
 26 recipient members, who are also members of the proposed class. One of LULAC's primary functions  
 27 and purposes is the improvement and advancement of educational opportunities for persons of Latino  
 28 and Mexican-American descent or nationality and the protection and defense of the civil rights of this

1 major ethnic and national origin group. As an organization and on behalf of its members, California  
 2 LULAC has championed the rights of Latino students for decades.

3       16. Plaintiff California LULAC's members include members of the proposed class. Wells  
 4 Fargo's policies of denying loans and other Credit products to DACA recipients affects many of  
 5 California LULAC's members. Additionally, Wells Fargo's policies impede California LULAC's  
 6 ability to carry out its mission to advance the educational attainment and civil rights of the Latino  
 7 population in California and, more broadly, throughout the United States.

8                   ***Defendant***

9       17. Wells Fargo is an American multinational banking and financial services company  
 10 headquartered in San Francisco, California. It is the fourth largest bank in the United States.

11       18. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. is a South Dakota corporation authorized to do business in this  
 12 state.

13       19. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. is a national bank and the primary United States operating  
 14 subsidiary of Wells Fargo.

15       20. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. offers consumers a range of financial and credit products,  
 16 including private student loans, credit cards, small business loans and credit products, personal loans,  
 17 auto loans, and home mortgages.

18       21. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., by soliciting, conducting, and transacting business in the state  
 19 of California, engages in continuous, permanent, and substantial activity within the state.

20       22. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. is not a federal enclave and therefore is subject to Plaintiffs'  
 21 Section 1981 claim.

22                   **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

23       23. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' Section 1981 claim pursuant  
 24 to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state law claims  
 25 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337.

26       24. This Court is empowered to issue a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201  
 27 and 2202.

1       25.     Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b)(2) because a substantial  
2 part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district and Wells Fargo  
3 conducts business within this district.

4       26. Intradistrict assignment: Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Local Rules 3-2(c) and (d), intradistrict  
5 assignment to the San Francisco Division is proper because a substantial part of the events which give  
6 rise to the claims asserted herein occurred at Wells Fargo's headquarters located in San Francisco  
7 County.

## BACKGROUND

9       27. On June 15, 2012, President Obama announced that the Department of Homeland  
10 Security (“DHS”) would no longer remove certain young immigrants under its authority to grant  
11 deferred action as embodied in DACA.

12        28.      DACA's purpose, according to President Obama, was to "[stop] expel[ling] talented  
13 young people, who . . . [have] been raised as Americans; understand themselves to be part of this  
14 country . . . [and] who want to staff our labs, or start new businesses, or defend our country."<sup>1</sup>

15        29.     DACA is a form of deferred action, a discretionary grant of authorized stay by the federal  
16 government. Deferred action granted through DACA is valid for two years and is subject to renewal  
17 thereafter.

18       30.     DACA mandates that persons who are granted deferred action will be eligible to obtain  
19 an Employment Authorization Document (an “EAD” or “federal work permit”) and a Social Security  
20 number. In other words, those granted deferred action and in possession of an EAD are legally  
21 authorized to work in the United States, and can prove their identity.

22        31. As of March 31, 2016, the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services  
23 ("USCIS") has approved over 1.3 million initial and renewal requests for DACA.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>25</sup> President Obama, Remarks by the President on Immigration (June 15, 2012), available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/06/15/remarks-president-immigration> (last visited March 6, 2017).

<sup>27</sup> USCIS, Number of I-821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals by Fiscal  
Year, Quarter, Intake, Biometrics and Case Status: 2012-2016 (March 31), available at  
[https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/Immigration%20Forms%20Data/All%20Form%20Types/DACA/I821d\\_performancedata\\_fy2016\\_qtr2.pdf](https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/Immigration%20Forms%20Data/All%20Form%20Types/DACA/I821d_performancedata_fy2016_qtr2.pdf) (last visited  
March 6, 2017).

1       32. There is no federal or state law or regulation that restricts banks from providing financial  
 2 products to customers because the customer is an alien. Under federal law, alienage is merely one factor  
 3 among many used to verify enough information to confirm the true identity of the customer.

4       33. For instance, the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (“FFIEC”) provides  
 5 uniform principles and standards to offer guidance for federal regulators. The FFIEC annually publishes  
 6 the Bank Secrecy Act/Anti-Money Laundering Examination Manual for Money Services, which  
 7 contains a compliance program called the Customer Identification Program (“CIP”), as required by  
 8 section 326 of the USA PATRIOT Act, 31 U.S.C. § 5318. Pursuant to CIP, institutions providing  
 9 financial services, including banks, must have a written policy in place to enable them to form a  
 10 reasonable belief that they know the true identity of each customer. The goal behind this requirement is  
 11 to prevent the funding of terrorism both inside and outside of the United States.<sup>3</sup>

12      34. According to the Bank Secrecy Act/Anti-Money Laundering Examination Manual, a  
 13 bank’s CIP must contain account-opening procedures detailing the identifying information that must be  
 14 obtained from each customer. At a minimum, the bank must obtain the following information from each  
 15 customer before opening an account: 1) name, 2) date of birth, 3) address, and 4) identification number  
 16 (e.g., Social Security number, taxpayer identification number or an alien identification number).<sup>4</sup>

17      35. The bank’s procedure must also describe when it will use documents, non-documentary  
 18 methods, or a combination of both. Federal banking agencies expect that banks will review an  
 19 unexpired government-issued form of identification from most customers. The identification must  
 20 include evidence of the customer’s nationality or residence and bear a photograph or similar safeguard.<sup>5</sup>

---

21  
 22  
 23  
 24      <sup>3</sup> See 12 C.F.R. 208.63(b), 211.5(m), 211.24(j) (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System);  
 25           12 C.F.R. 326.8(b) (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation); 12 C.F.R. 748.2(b) (National Credit Union  
 26           Administration); 12 C.F.R. 21.21 (Office of the Comptroller of the Currency); 12 C.F.R. 563.177(b)  
 27           (Office of Thrift Supervision); and 31 C.F.R. 103.121 (FinCEN).

28      <sup>4</sup> Fed. Fin. Inst. Examination Council, Bank Secrecy Act/Anti-Money Laundering Examination  
 29           Manual 54 (2010), available at  
 30           [http://www.ffiec.gov/bsa\\_aml\\_infobase/documents/bsa\\_aml\\_man\\_2010.pdf](http://www.ffiec.gov/bsa_aml_infobase/documents/bsa_aml_man_2010.pdf) (last visited March 6,  
 31           2017).

32      <sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 54 n.48.

1       36. Compliance with the CIP is to ensure that a bank verify enough information to form a  
2 reasonable belief that it knows the true identity of the customer.<sup>6</sup>

3       37. “Opening an account” and a financial services “customer” for purposes of the Bank  
4 Secrecy Act/Anti Money Laundering Examination Manual for Money Services includes an individual  
5 who has applied for a loan application.<sup>7</sup>

## **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

## **Plaintiff Perez**

8       38. Ms. Perez is a DACA recipient with an EAD and Social Security number. She is a  
9 third-year student at UC Riverside.

10       39. On August 26, 2016, Ms. Perez sought a student loan through the Wells Fargo website  
11 to help pay for cost of attendance and college-incurred debt. After answering a few preliminary  
12 questions, including that she was seeking a loan to pay student expenses, that she was a junior in  
13 college, and that she was neither a U.S. citizen nor a permanent resident, she was denied a loan,  
14 receiving a message that read: "Thank you for your interest in a Wells Fargo student loan. However,  
15 based on information you provided, we do not have a student loan option that meets your needs. This  
16 could be due to the school you selected, your field of study, and/or your citizenship status."

17        40. In an attempt to better understand the reason for the denial, Ms. Perez returned to the  
18 prior screen and changed the response to the question about citizenship to “I am a permanent resident  
19 alien,” and she received information about a student loan option. At the top of the screen there was a  
20 note that read: “Based on the citizenship status you provided, a U.S. citizen cosigner will be required  
21 for this application.” Ms. Perez was thus denied a student loan due to her citizenship status. Had Ms.  
22 Perez been allowed to apply for a loan, she would have had a cosigner available to meet Wells Fargo’s  
23 cosigner requirement.

24       41. Ms. Perez suffered a loss of money as a result of Wells Fargo's denial of her student  
25 loan application because she was forced to finance her cost of attendance using various credit cards  
26 with interest rates higher than she would have received through a student loan. Ms. Perez suffered

28 | 6 *Id.* at 52-4.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 53.

1 further losses of money because she was then unable to meet all her credit card payment obligations  
 2 and incurred resulting financial penalties.

3 **Plaintiff Acosta**

4 42. Mr. Acosta is a DACA recipient with an EAD and Social Security number. He works  
 5 at a real estate company and is a small business owner in Austin, Texas. He has a bachelor's degree in  
 6 construction science and a master's degree in real estate from Texas A&M University.

7 43. On or around August 2015, Mr. Acosta applied for a commercial equipment loan for  
 8 approximately \$13,000 at a local Wells Fargo branch in Austin, Texas. Mr. Acosta wanted to use the  
 9 loan to purchase a truck and expand his construction business. A personal banker from the branch  
 10 assisted him with his application. Mr. Acosta informed the Wells Fargo personal banker that he was  
 11 neither a U.S. citizen nor a permanent resident. The personal banker told Mr. Acosta that he would just  
 12 go ahead and submit Mr. Acosta's application and await a response.

13 44. A couple of days later, the same Wells Fargo personal banker called Mr. Acosta and told  
 14 him to return to the branch to provide further documentation for his Social Security number. Mr. Acosta  
 15 provided a copy of his Social Security card, his EAD, and his driver's license.

16 45. At the time of his commercial equipment loan application, Mr. Acosta already had a  
 17 Wells Fargo credit card which he maintained in good standing and a loan from Wells Fargo's dealership  
 18 services, both of which he obtained in 2014. He also maintained both personal and business checking  
 19 accounts with Wells Fargo.

20 46. Within two weeks after he provided additional documentation, the same Wells Fargo  
 21 personal banker called Mr. Acosta and informed him that Wells Fargo did not approve his loan  
 22 application because he was neither a U.S. citizen nor a permanent resident. The Wells Fargo personal  
 23 banker told Mr. Acosta that this was pursuant to Wells Fargo's policy. A few days later, Mr. Acosta  
 24 received a letter in the mail from Wells Fargo confirming his loan denial.

25 47. Shortly after Wells Fargo denied him the loan, Wells Fargo also abruptly cancelled Mr.  
 26 Acosta's credit card account without giving him notice and sent his outstanding credit card balance—  
 27 which was approximately \$4,400—to its Wells Fargo Collections Department, where it quickly accrued  
 28 interest.

1       48. Mr. Acosta called Wells Fargo's customer service line to request re-activation of his  
2 credit card. The Wells Fargo customer representative who he spoke with told him that they would  
3 investigate and follow up. He did not hear back from Wells Fargo and his credit card was not  
4 reactivated.

5       49. Mr. Acosta suffered a loss of money as a result of Wells Fargo's denial of his commercial  
6 loan application because he had to take out a loan with the truck dealership directly at a higher interest  
7 rate than he would have obtained through a lending bank.

8              **Plaintiff Barajas**

9       50. Mr. Barajas is a DACA recipient with an EAD and Social Security number. He is a  
10 part-time student at Chabot Community College in Hayward, California, pursuing an Associate's  
11 degree in Nursing.

12       51. On or about March 2016, Mr. Barajas applied for a Wells Fargo credit card in person at  
13 a Wells Fargo branch in San Lorenzo, California. Mr. Barajas believed that because he already had a  
14 checking and savings account with Wells Fargo, that he could also obtain a credit card from the bank.  
15 Mr. Barajas wanted to use the credit card to pay for his educational expenses, such as tuition and  
16 books, so that he could attend school full-time. Full-time tuition was then approximately \$2,000 per  
17 semester.

18       52. He filled out the Wells Fargo credit card application form and submitted it to a personal  
19 banker.

20       53. On or around June 22, 2016, Mr. Barajas received a letter from Wells Fargo asking him  
21 for his Social Security number.

22       54. Mr. Barajas went back to the San Lorenzo branch in person and provided Wells Fargo  
23 with a copy of his Social Security card, EAD, and driver's license. The personal banker assisting him  
24 made copies of his documents and uploaded them with his application.

25       55. Later the same day, Wells Fargo called Mr. Barajas to request a copy of his "green card."  
26 The Wells Fargo representative told him that if he did not have a green card, Wells Fargo would deny  
27 his credit card application. Left with no choice, Mr. Barajas instructed the Wells Fargo representative to  
28 cancel his application.

1       56. Mr. Barajas suffered a loss of money as a result of Wells Fargo's denial of his credit card  
2 application because he was forced to withdraw approximately \$600 from his savings account to pay for  
3 his tuition.

4           **Plaintiff Diaz Vedoy**

5       57. Ms. Diaz Vedoy is a DACA recipient with an EAD. She is an undergraduate student at  
6 Cerritos College.

7       58. On or about January 28, 2017, Ms. Diaz Vedoy visited a Wells Fargo branch office  
8 seeking a personal loan for approximately \$6,000 and a credit card to help pay for college-incurred  
9 debt and for her parents' immigration application. Ms. Diaz Vedoy's parents' immigration application  
10 cost approximately \$5,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees, and Ms. Vedoy also wanted to use the Wells  
11 Fargo credit card to consolidate the balances from three other cards and save on interest rate  
12 payments.

13       59. After completing paperwork for both applications and leaving the Wells Fargo branch  
14 office, she later received a telephone call asking her to return to the Wells Fargo branch office and  
15 provide a copy of her Social Security card.

16       60. On or about February 7, 2017, Ms. Diaz Vedoy returned to the Wells Fargo branch  
17 office with her Social Security card. A Wells Fargo employee made a photocopy of Ms. Diaz  
18 Vedoy's Social Security card and returned it to her.

19       61. In early February 2017, Ms. Diaz Vedoy received a letter from Wells Fargo dated  
20 February 8, 2017, stating that her application for a personal loan and credit card were denied because  
21 she was "not a permanent United States resident."

22       62. Ms. Diaz Vedoy suffered a loss of money as a result of Wells Fargo's denial of credit  
23 because she was forced to take out \$3,000 from her personal savings to pay for her parents'  
24 immigration application and cover other college-related expenses on credit cards with higher interest  
25 rates.

1                   **Plaintiff Rodas**

2         63. Ms. Rodas is a DACA recipient with an EAD and Social Security number. She is a  
 3 second-year graduate student at LMU, studying counseling.

4         64. In early June 2016, Ms. Rodas contacted Wells Fargo in order to inquire about applying  
 5 for a student loan to pay for her summer session. The Wells Fargo representative informed Ms. Rodas  
 6 that she would need a co-signer because she was not a U.S. citizen, and that she would need to fill out  
 7 her application online.

8         65. Soon thereafter, Ms. Rodas submitted a Wells Fargo student loan application online. She  
 9 noted in her application that she was a “Non-Resident Alien,” and submitted her EAD and Social  
 10 Security card.

11         66. Ms. Rodas obtained a co-signer, who also submitted paperwork by mail in connection  
 12 with Ms. Rodas’s application.

13         67. On or around June 13, 2016, a Wells Fargo representative contacted Ms. Rodas,  
 14 requesting that she submit either an I-20 or an I-94 form. Ms. Rodas informed the Wells Fargo  
 15 representative that she did not have either of those forms because she did not have the visas associated  
 16 with those forms. The Wells Fargo representative suggested that she contact LMU and ask if they  
 17 would assist her in obtaining an S-1 visa for international students. At Wells Fargo’s behest, Ms. Rodas  
 18 contacted LMU to inquire about the S-1 visa and LMU told her she was not qualified for such a visa.  
 19 Ms. Rodas then resubmitted information to Wells Fargo regarding her DACA status.

20         68. Ms. Rodas called Wells Fargo sometime in July 2016 to follow-up on her student loan  
 21 application. A Wells Fargo representative informed Ms. Rodas that her application had been denied  
 22 because she was not a permanent resident. Ms. Rodas later received confirmation about her denial in the  
 23 mail.

24         69. Ms. Rodas suffered a loss of money as a result of Wells Fargo’s denial of her student  
 25 loan application because she ended up borrowing approximately \$5,000 from various family members  
 26 and had to pay some educational expenses from her own savings. Because she owed family members so  
 27 much money, Ms. Rodas was also forced to work more hours at her job, cutting into her time for  
 28 academic studies and forcing her to only take one class during the Fall semester.

1                   **Plaintiff Tabares Villafuerte**

2       70.       Mr. Tabares Villafuerte is a DACA recipient with an EAD. He is a third-year student  
3 at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, California.

4       71.       In January 2017, Mr. Tabares Villafuerte visited a Wells Fargo branch office in  
5 Riverside, California, seeking a student credit card to build a positive credit history and to pay for  
6 educational expenses. After completing the credit card application with a personal banker and leaving  
7 the Wells Fargo branch office, he later received a telephone call from the personal banker asking him  
8 to return to the branch office and provide a copy of his Social Security card.

9       72.       Mr. Tabares Villafuerte returned soon thereafter to the Wells Fargo branch office with  
10 his Social Security card. The Wells Fargo representative made a photocopy of Mr. Tabares  
11 Villafuerte's Social Security card, as well as his work authorization card and driver's license, and  
12 returned them to him.

13       73.       Soon thereafter, Mr. Tabares Villafuerte received a phone call from the same personal  
14 banker informing him that Wells Fargo denied his credit card application because his Social Security  
15 number was "a different kind of social." Then a few days later, he received a letter dated January 30,  
16 2017, from Wells Fargo stating that his application for a credit card was denied because he was "not a  
17 permanent United States resident."

18       74.       Mr. Tabares Villafuerte suffered a loss of money as a result of Wells Fargo's denial of  
19 his student credit card application because he was forced to use over \$2,000 of his personal savings  
20 for his educational expenses.

21                   **Wells Fargo's Policies Are Unlawful and Harm Plaintiffs**

22       75.       Wells Fargo's refusal to offer Plaintiffs and other non-U.S. citizens who are members of  
23 California LULAC an opportunity to contract for credit because of its arbitrary citizenship requirements  
24 is a violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981.

25       76.       Wells Fargo's refusal to offer Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares  
26 Villafuerte and other non-U.S. citizens who are members of California LULAC an opportunity to  
27 contract for credit violates California's Unruh Civil Rights Act.

77. Wells Fargo's refusal to offer Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villa fuerte and other non-U.S. citizens who are members of California LULAC an opportunity to contract for credit violates the California Unfair Competition Law.

78. In addition, Wells Fargo's unlawful policies harm California LULAC's ability to carry out its mission and forces it to divert resources from its primary advocacy projects in order to assist its members who are adversely affected by their inability to obtain student loans and other financial products from Wells Fargo.

79. There is an actual and substantial controversy between Plaintiffs and Wells Fargo.

## **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

80. Plaintiffs Perez, Acosta, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte bring their class allegations under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a), (b)(2), and (b)(3) on behalf of four classes, each consisting of all non-United States citizens who resided in the United States and who held either (i) DACA status, (ii) temporary protected status, or (iii) another legally protected status under any United States visa at the relevant time they applied or attempted to apply for credit from Wells Fargo (“Covered Non-Citizen Residents”) from January 30, 2013 through the date of final judgment in this action (“Covered Period”), defined as follows:

- a. All Covered Non-Citizen Residents who applied or attempted to apply for a Wells Fargo student loan and did not receive that loan during the Covered Period (the “Student Loan Class”);
  - b. All Covered Non-Citizen Residents who applied or attempted to apply for a Wells Fargo unsecured credit card and did not receive that credit card during the Covered Period (the “Credit Card Class”);
  - c. All Covered Non-Citizen Residents who held a greater than 24% ownership interest in a business and applied or attempted to apply for a Wells Fargo Business Direct

1 credit product for that business and did not receive that credit product during the  
 2 Covered Period (the “Business Direct Class”); and

3 d. All Covered Non-Citizen Residents who applied or attempted to apply for a Wells  
 4 Fargo automobile loan, personal loan, or home mortgage and did not receive those  
 5 loans or mortgage during the Covered Period (the “A/P/M Class”).

6 81. Plaintiffs Perez and Rodas are members of the Student Loan Class.

7 82. Plaintiffs Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, and Tabares Villafuerte are members of the Credit Card  
 8 Class.

9 83. Plaintiff Acosta is a member of the Business Direct Class.

10 84. Plaintiff Diaz Vedoy is a member of the A/P/M Class.

11 85. Upon information and belief, Class Members in each of the four classes are so numerous  
 12 that joinder of all of them is impracticable. Plaintiffs believe there are hundreds of Class Members in  
 13 each of the four classes. Wells Fargo has offices throughout the United States and is one of the largest  
 14 consumer lenders in the country, USCIS has approved over 1.3 million initial and renewal requests for  
 15 DACA, and several hundred thousand individuals have held temporary protected status or legally  
 16 protected status under U.S. visas. Plaintiffs do not know the precise number of Class Members in each  
 17 class as this information is in Wells Fargo’s possession.

18 86. There are questions of law and fact common to the four classes, and these questions  
 19 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members. Common questions include, for  
 20 each class, among others: (1) whether Wells Fargo maintains policies that exclude Plaintiffs and Class  
 21 Members outright from credit because of Plaintiffs’ and Class Members’ alienage or immigration status;  
 22 (2) whether Wells Fargo’s policies as set forth above deprives Plaintiffs and Class Members of the right  
 23 to contract in violation of Section 1981; (3) whether Wells Fargo’s policies as set forth above deprive  
 24 Plaintiffs and Class Members in the Student Loan, Credit Card, and A/P/M classes of rights under the  
 25 Unruh Civil Rights Act; (4) whether Wells Fargo’s policies as set forth above deprive Plaintiffs and  
 26 Class Members in the Student Loan, Credit Card, and A/P/M classes of rights under the California  
 27 Unfair Competition Law; (5) whether Plaintiffs and the Class Members suffered harm by reason of  
 28 Wells Fargo’s unlawful policies; (6) whether Plaintiffs and Class Members are entitled to compensatory

1 damages; (7) whether Plaintiffs and Class Members are entitled to punitive damages; (8) what equitable  
 2 and injunctive relief for each of the four classes is warranted; and (9) the scope of a resulting permanent  
 3 injunction.

4       87. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Class Members in each of the four  
 5 classes: (1) Plaintiffs were within the jurisdiction of the United States and held legally protected status;  
 6 (2) Plaintiffs applied or attempted to apply for credit from Wells Fargo; and (3) Plaintiffs did not receive  
 7 that credit because of their alienage or immigration status. Each of these claims is substantially shared  
 8 by every Class Member in each of the four Classes. Each of the claims arises from the same course of  
 9 conduct by Wells Fargo, and the relief sought is common.

10      88. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class  
 11 Members in each of the four classes. Plaintiffs have no conflict with any Class Member. Plaintiffs are  
 12 committed to the goal of having Wells Fargo change its business practices to stop discriminating against  
 13 Plaintiffs and others who hold DACA status, temporary protected status, or other legally protected  
 14 statuses.

15      89. Plaintiffs have retained counsel competent and experienced in complex discrimination  
 16 class actions.

17      90. The universe of people affected by Wells Fargo's unlawful policies is ascertainable  
 18 through Wells Fargo's company records and its website records, logs, and data and therefore each of the  
 19 four proposed classes is ascertainable.

20      91. Class certification is appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) because Wells  
 21 Fargo has acted and/or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to each of the four classes, making  
 22 appropriate declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to Plaintiff and the Class Members as a whole.  
 23 Wells Fargo excludes Class Members in each of the four classes outright from credit due to alienage or  
 24 immigration status. The Class Members in each of the four classes are entitled to injunctive relief to end  
 25 Wells Fargo's common, unfair, and discriminatory policies and other make-whole relief.

26      92. Class certification is also appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) because  
 27 common questions of fact and law predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class  
 28 Members in each of the four classes, and because a class action is superior to other available methods

1 for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation since joinder of all members is impracticable. The  
2 Class Members have been damaged and are entitled to recovery because of Wells Fargo's common,  
3 unfair, and discriminatory policies. Damages are capable of measurement on a classwide basis. The  
4 propriety and amount of punitive damages are based on Wells Fargo's conduct, making these issues  
5 common each of the four classes. Plaintiffs and the Class Members will rely on common evidence to  
6 resolve their legal and factual questions, including applicable credit policies in the relevant period.  
7 There are no pending actions raising similar claims. Wells Fargo engages in continuous, permanent, and  
8 substantial activity in California. There will be no undue difficulty in the management of this litigation  
9 as a class action.

**FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
**Alienage Discrimination**  
**(42 U.S.C. § 1981)**

93. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

94. Plaintiffs bring this claim on their own behalf and on behalf of each of the four classes.

95. Plaintiff California LULAC brings this claim on its behalf.

96. Plaintiffs are persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

97. Plaintiffs are aliens.

98. Plaintiffs have the right to make and enforce contracts in the United States and are entitled to the full and equal benefits of the law.

99. Wells Fargo intentionally discriminated against Plaintiffs and the Class Members in each four classes because of alienage by denying them the opportunity to contract for credit.

100. Wells Fargo's intentional discrimination against Plaintiffs and the Class Members in each  
four classes interfered with their right to make and enforce contracts for credit.

101. Wells Fargo's policies of denying credit based on Plaintiffs' and the Class Members' age harmed Plaintiffs and the Class Members and constitutes unlawful alienage discrimination in making and enforcing of contracts in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981. Plaintiff California LULAC has been harmed, as it has been forced to divert resources from its primary advocacy projects in order to its members who are adversely affected by their inability to obtain loans or other credit products Wells Fargo.

102. Plaintiffs and the Class Members have no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at law to redress the wrongs alleged herein, and the injunctive relief sought in this action is the only means of securing complete and adequate relief. Plaintiffs and the Class Members they seek to represent are now suffering, and will continue to suffer, irreparable injury from Wells Fargo's discriminatory acts and omissions.

103. Wells Fargo's conduct has caused, and continues to cause, Plaintiffs and the Class Members substantial losses in earnings and other work benefits.

**SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
**Violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act**  
**(California Civil Code §§ 51 and 52 et seq.)**

104. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

11 105. Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte bring this claim on  
12 their own behalf and on behalf of the Class Members in the Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class, and  
13 A/P/M Class.

106. Plaintiff California LULAC brings this claim on its behalf.

15        107. Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte are persons within  
16 the jurisdiction of the United States.

17       108. Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte are aliens who hold  
18 DACA status.

19       109. Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte are entitled to the  
20 full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business  
21 establishments of every kind whatsoever no matter their immigration status and no business  
22 establishment of any kind whatsoever may refuse to contract with Plaintiffs because of their  
23 immigration status.

24        110. Wells Fargo intentionally discriminated against Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy,  
25 Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte and the Class Members in the Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class,  
26 and A/P/M Class on the basis of immigration status by denying them the opportunity to contract for  
27 credit, and in doing so denied them the full and equal services of its business.

111. Wells Fargo's intentional discrimination against Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte and the Class Members in the Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class, and A/P/M Class interfered with their right to full and equal services and their right to make and enforce contracts for credit.

112. Wells Fargo's policies of denying credit based on the immigration status of Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte, and the Class Members in the Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class, and A/P/M Class harmed Plaintiffs and the Class Members and constitutes unlawful discrimination in violation of Sections 51(b) and 51.5 of the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Plaintiff California LULAC has also been harmed, as it has been forced to divert resources from its primary advocacy projects in order to assist its members who are adversely affected by their inability to obtain loans or financial products from Wells Fargo.

113. Pursuant to the Section 52(a) of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte and the Class Members in the Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class, and A/P/M Class are entitled to actual damages suffered, statutory damages of up to three times the amount of actual damages suffered per violation, but no less than \$4,000, and attorney's fees. Pursuant to Section 52(c) of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte and the Class Members in the Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class, and A/P/M Class are also entitled to injunctive and other equitable relief against such unlawful practices in order to prevent future damages, for which there is no adequate remedy at law, and to avoid a multiplicity of lawsuits.

**THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
**Violation of Unfair Competition Law**  
**(California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq.)**

114. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

115. Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte bring this claim on their own behalf and on behalf of the Class Members in the Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class, and A/P/M Class.

116. Plaintiff California LULAC brings this claim on its behalf.

1        117. Wells Fargo's policies of denying credit to Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas,  
2 and Tabares Villafuerte and the Class Members in the Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class, and  
3 A/P/M Class based on their alienage and immigration status harmed Plaintiffs and the Class and  
4 constitutes unlawful discrimination in violation of Sections 51(b) and 51.5 of the Unruh Civil Rights Act  
5 and 42 U.S.C. Section 1981. Plaintiff California LULAC has also been harmed, as it has been forced to  
6 divert resources from its primary advocacy projects in order to assist its members who are adversely  
7 affected by their inability to obtain student loans or other financial products from Wells Fargo.

8        118.   Wells Fargo's violations of Sections 51(b) and 51.5 of the Unruh Civil Rights Act and 42  
9 U.S.C. § 1981 constitute unfair business practices in violation of Section 17200 of the California Unfair  
10 Competition Law.

11        119. Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte and the Class  
12 Members in the Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class, and A/P/M Class are entitled to injunctive and  
13 other equitable relief against such unlawful practices in order to prevent future damages, for which there  
14 is no adequate remedy at law, and to avoid a multiplicity of lawsuits.

15        120. Under the California Unfair Competition Law, Plaintiffs Perez, Barajas, Diaz Vedoy,  
16 Rodas, and Tabares Villafuerte and the Class Members in the Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class,  
17 and A/P/M Class are entitled to injunctive relief and attorney's fees.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

19           **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs and the Class Members in each of the four classes pray for relief as  
20 follows:

21        121. Certification of the case as a class action on behalf of the proposed Class Members in the  
22 Student Loan Class, Credit Card Class, Business Direct Class, and A/P/M Class.

122. Designation of Plaintiffs Perez and Rodas as representatives on behalf of the Student  
Loan Class.

123. Designation of Plaintiffs Barajas, Diaz Vedoy, and Tabares Villafuerte as representatives  
on behalf of the Credit Card Class.

27 124. Designation of Plaintiff Acosta as a representative on behalf of the Business Direct Class.  
28 125. Designation of Plaintiff Diaz Vedoy as a representative on behalf of the A/P/M Class.

126. Designation of Plaintiffs' counsel of record as Class counsel;

127. A declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and violate  
in 1981, the Sections 51(b) and 51.5 of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, and Section 17200 *et seq.* of  
California Unfair Competition Law;

128. A preliminary and permanent injunction against Wells Fargo and its officers, agents, successors, employees, representatives, and any and all persons acting in concert with them, from engaging in each of the unlawful policies, practices, customs and usages set forth herein;

129. All damages sustained as a result of Wells Fargo's conduct, including damages for  
emotional distress, humiliation, embarrassment, and anguish, according to proof;

130. Statutory damages to the extent allowable by law;

131. Exemplary and punitive damages in an amount commensurate with Wells Fargo's ability  
and to deter future conduct;

### 132. Injunctive remedies including restitution;

133. Costs incurred herein, including reasonable attorneys' fees to the extent allowable by

134. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, as provided by law; and

135. Such other and further legal and equitable relief as this Court deems necessary, just, and

Dated: Washington, DC  
February 16, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Patrick David Lopez  
**OUTTEN & GOLDEN LLP**

Patrick David Lopez\*  
601 Massachusetts Avenue  
Second Floor West Suite  
Washington DC, 20001  
Telephone: (202) 847-4400  
Facsimile: (202) 847-4410  
[pdl@outtengolden.com](mailto:pdl@outtengolden.com)

1 Jahan C. Sagafi (Cal. Bar No. 224887)  
2 Relic Sun (Cal. Bar No. 306701)  
3 Rachel Dempsey (Cal. Bar No. 310424)  
4 One Embarcadero Center, 38th Floor  
5 San Francisco, CA 94111  
6 Telephone: (415) 638-8800  
7 Facsimile: (415) 638-8810  
8 jsagafi@outtengolden.com  
9 rsun@outtengolden.com  
10 rdempsey@outtengolden.com

11 Ossai Miazad\*  
12 Michael N. Litrownik\*  
13 685 Third Avenue, 25th Floor  
14 New York, NY 10017  
15 Telephone: (212) 245-1000  
16 Facsimile: (646) 509-2060  
17 om@outtengolden.com  
18 mlitrownik@outtengolden.com

19 **MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE AND  
20 EDUCATIONAL FUND**

21 Thomas A. Saenz (Cal. Bar No. 159430)  
22 Joel Marrero (Cal. Bar No. 275601)  
23 Andrés Gallegos (Cal. Bar No. 313090)  
24 634 S. Spring St., 11th Floor  
25 Los Angeles, CA 90014  
26 Telephone: (213) 629-2512  
27 Facsimile: (213) 629-0266  
28 tsaenz@maldef.org  
jmarrero@maldef.org  
agallegos@maldef.org

\*admitted *pro hac vice*

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the proposed Class*